

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/828,435	04/20/2004	Kung-Hwa Wei	BA - 22878 (WEI, et al)	5377
75	90 12/28/2005		EXAM	INER
Joseph J. Orlai	ndo		PENG, KU	O LIANG
BUCKNAM AND ARCHER 1077 Northern Boulevard			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Roslyn, NY 11576			1712	
• 1				

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			. /
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/828,435	WEI ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Kuo-Liang Peng	1712
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any (	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL'CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Designs of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/3.  This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise 11/2.	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ <b>Applicati</b> 9)⊠ 10)⊠	Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2004 is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	r election requirement. er. ⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
12)⊠ a)ĺ	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
A.u	4.3		•
2)  Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 6/9/04, 6/14/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's election of the invention of Group I in the response to the restriction requirement filed on November 30, 2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Groups II, Claims 5-10 are further canceled in the aforementioned response.

Now, Claims 1-4 are pending.

#### Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally <u>limited to a single</u> paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be

avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

# Claim Objections

3. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In Claim 2 (line 4), before "12", should there be -- or --?

In Claim 2 (line 5), should "alkyl" and "phenyl" be -- alkylene -- and -- phenylene --, respectively?

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In Claim 1 (line 4), it is not clear as to what "certain mechanical properties" refers to.

In Claim 2 (line 3), "typically" causes confusion because it is not clear as to what non-typical chemical formulae are.

In Claims 2 (line 6) and 3 (line 2), the Markush language is improper.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd.

App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, Claim 2 recites the broad recitation "other derivatives having diamine group" (line 7), and the claim also recites "for example, reactive functional groups as -R1-N(-Ar-NH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>, ....and the like" (lines 7-9) which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

In Claim 2 (line 8), it is not clear as to what "-Ar-" refers to.

In Claims 2 (line 9) and 3 (last two lines), it is not clear as to what "and the like" refers to.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 7. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sevida (US 6 767 930).

Sevjda discloses a nanocomposite formed of modified polyhedral oligomeric silsesquioxane (POSS) and polyimide through covalent bonding. (col. 3, line 35 to col. 6, line 11 and Figures) Since Sevjda's nanocomposite reads on that of Applicant', both should possess the same properties set forth in the present invention. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

Page 6

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuo-Liang Peng whose telephone number is (571) 272-1091. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski, can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

klp

December 24, 2005

Kuo-Liang Peng Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1712